

REMARKS

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Examiner rejects Claims 18-23 and 25-36 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hakkinen in view of Rahman.

Examiner notes that Hakkinen fails to teach a set of common radio link configuration parameters or a radio link change message. Applicant agrees. Hakkinen only describes the steps to first establish a connection between a mobile station and a base station in a CDMA type of wireless system. It does not provide any teaching of how to change radio link configuration after a connection has been established between a plurality of base stations.

Examiner reasons that Rahman teaches the features missing from Hakkinen, but Applicant respectfully disagrees with this reasoning.

Rahman relates to a wireless communications system which can support macrodiversity. A system controller permits macrodiversity only to certain types of wireless unit in order to conserve wireless resources. Mobile units, or limited fixed mobile units meeting certain criteria, are permitted to use macrodiversity but fixed wireless units are not. Rahman describes how a Received Signal Strength Indicator (RSSI) can be used to decide on whether macrodiversity should be enabled or disabled for a particular wireless unit. The operating category and other parameters are specific to each wireless unit.

Rahman only describes how to make a decision on whether a wireless unit should be allowed to begin to use macrodiversity, based on the operating category of a wireless unit and the RSSI. In contrast, the present invention, as defined by claim 1, relates to a terminal which is already in macrodiversity with a plurality of base stations, and where a change needs to be made to a

configuration parameter of the radio links to those base stations. In the present invention the multiple radio links have the same radio link parameters such as for example (but not limited to) transport block size, transport block set size, transmission time interval, type of channel coding, type of channel interleaving or rate matching.

Examiner points to col. 8 lines 61-67 of Rahman as showing the feature of a set of common radio link configuration parameters. However, this passage of Rahman simply describes the sending of the category of a wireless unit (i.e. whether it is a fixed or mobile unit) which tells the system when the unit should be allowed to use macrodiversity. This is not the same as common parameters of ongoing radio links between a terminal and a base station supporting macrodiversity.

Examiner points to col. 9 lines 5-9 of Rahman as showing the feature of dynamically updating radio link configuration parameters. However, this passage simply describes when the system can change the category of a wireless unit (i.e. fixed, mobile or limited mobile) or parameters such as the RSSI level that will trigger when macrodiversity will be enabled. This, again, is distinctly different from what is required by Claim 1. Rahman provides no instruction of what happens during macrodiversity, or of how to make a change to common radio link parameters during macrodiversity. Rahman also fails to teach the particularly advantageous solution recited in Claim 1 of the present invention of waiting until an acknowledgement has been received from at least one base station transceiver in transmitting communication with the mobile terminal, at least one base station transceiver in receiving communication with the mobile terminal and the mobile terminal before implementing a change to the radio link.

As Rahman fails to teach the features missing in Hakkinen, Claim 18 is considered to be allowable over a combination of Hakkinen and Rahman. Claims 26, 32, 34 and 36 include the same, or similar, features as Claim 18 and

are considered allowable for the same reasons as Claim 18. Claims 19-23, 27-31, 33 and 35 depend on one of Claims 18, 26, 32, 34 or 36 and are therefore allowable at least by virtue of depending on one of these allowable claims.

Examiner rejects Claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hakkinen in view of Rahman and Lee.

Claim 24 depends on Claim 18, which is considered to be allowable for the reasons stated above. Claim 24 is also considered to be allowable at least by virtue of depending on Claim 18.


Applicant takes this opportunity to amend Claims 18 and 34 to clarify that the radio link configuration change message is transmitted to the plurality of base station transceivers (i.e. the base station transceivers supporting the communication in macrodiversity) and to correct a typographical error in Claim 36.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims pending in this application are in condition for allowance. Early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is solicited.

An appropriate petition for extension of time is also submitted herewith.

Date: December 27, 2004

Respectfully submitted,



William M. Lee, Jr.
Barnes & Thornburg
P. O. Box 2786
Chicago, Illinois 60690-2786
312-357-1313 Telephone
312-759-5646 Facsimile